

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed August 27, 2007. In the Office Action, claims 1-6, 8-12 and 23-29 were pending and rejected. With this amendment, claims 1 and 23 are amended and the remaining claims are unchanged in the application.

Section Two of the Office Action rejected claims 1-6 and 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. With respect to this rejection, the Office Action indicated that independent claim 1 recites new limitations with respect to the first and second RTD's being separated from the exhaust stream by the first and second protective covers, respectively. Applicants have canceled that claim language. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1-6 and 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, may now be withdrawn.

Section Six of the Office Action indicated that claim 1, among others, was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheridan et al. (U.S. Patent 5,627,328 - hereinafter Sheridan) in view of Dalla Betta et al. (U.S. Patent 5,314,828 - hereinafter Dalla Betta). Applicants have amended independent claim 1 in order to better distinguish that claim from the combined teachings of Sheridan and Dalla Betta. Specifically, independent claim 1 now recites that each of the first and second RTD's is thermally coupled to its respective protective cover by a thermoconductive material. Support for this limitation may be found, at least, on page 12 of Applicants' specification beginning on line 13 which provides, "Thermal contact between RTD elements 34 and 36 and the RTD cover may be facilitated by using a thermoconductive material, such as a thermoconductive powder, cement, or epoxy...." Applicants

respectfully submit that such thermally conductive material coupling RTD's to protective covers is neither taught nor suggested by Dalla Betta or Sheridan. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claim 1 is allowable over those references, taken alone or in combination.

Section Twelve of the Office Action indicated that independent claim 23, among others, was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isenberg (U.S. Patent 4,428,817) in view of Ruka et al. (U.S. Patent 5,021,304 - hereinafter Ruka). Applicants have amended independent claim 23 in order to better distinguish that claim from the Isenberg and Ruka references. Specifically, independent claim 23 now recites that the reference and working electrodes are disposed on the same surface of the solid electrolyte. Support for this limitation is clearly found in Applicants' FIG. 1. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that this is wholly unlike the system of Isenberg which shows electrodes 35 and 27 on opposite sides of electrolyte 33. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that Ruka also shows electrodes on opposite sides of the solid electrolyte. Specifically, exterior porous electrode 10 is disposed on one side of ion conducting electrolyte 13 while interior electrode 14 is disposed on the other side. Accordingly, Ruka does not teach or suggest the features of amended independent claim 23. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claim 23 is allowable over Isenberg and Ruka, taken alone or in combination.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully submit that the entire application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency

required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit
Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Christopher R. Christenson, Reg. No. 42,413
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

CRC:sew